

... THE ...

# Converted Catholic

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."--Luke xxii: 32.

Vol. XIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

No. 9.

## EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS.

IN the story of his life which Mr. Pachayan has written for this issue of the CONVERTED CATHOLIC, he tells us that one of the proofs of papal infallibility, if not the only one, which the Roman theologians adduce in support of that dogma is the verse in Luke (22:32): "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." This solitary text is not a very strong proof of Peter's infallibility or of his so-called successor's, Leo XIII. Our Lord prayed for Peter, as He did for all other disciples, and as He is doing to this day. In Hebrews 7:25, we read: "Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."

In His prayer to the Father for His disciples—and all who believe in Him and follow Him and serve Him in our day are His disciples as truly as were those whom He first called—Jesus lifted up His eyes to Heaven and said:

Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee:

As thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given Him.

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. (John 17.)

Our Lord prayed for Peter, as He did for the other disciples, and as He is doing continually for all those who receive Him as Saviour. To them He gives power to become the children of God, even to them that believe in His name. But He did not make Peter infallible, for Peter denied Him. If Pope Leo XIII. should deny Christ to-day (and it is possible he might do so) where would his infallibility be? He practically denies Christ when he exalts the Virgin Mary. The Mariolatry that Mr. Pachayan witnessed at the Seminary of Issy was one of the factors that led to his conversion. It was there he was first led to question and doubt the claims of Rome.

The Rev. Stephen Pachayan, the young Roman Catholic Armenian who was recommended to Christ's Mission by the Protestants of France, represented by M. Eugene Reveillaud, editor of the *Paris Signal*, arrived in New York from France the first week in August, and was immediately received

into the Mission. Mr. Reveillaud's letter recommending this young priest was published in the August CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

Through the kind providence of God this Armenian convert was able to attend Mr. Moody's Bible Conference at Northfield, Mass., where we introduced him to many ministers, and other Christian friends, who cordially welcomed him into the household of the faith. It was our privilege to interpret for him in an address which he delivered in French, at Northfield.

#### After Thirty Years.

The Psalmist says: "Thy youth is renewed like the eagle's." So it was with us when the young Armenian ecclesiastic, Stephen Pachayan, came to Christ's Mission last month from the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. More than thirty years ago we passed through the same experience as our young brother in that Seminary, with this exception, that though we were surprised at many things that we witnessed in the devotion to Mary we did not doubt any article of the Roman faith. To be sure, we did not know anything about that faith but what our teachers told us. We were then only eighteen years of age, and with the credulity of youth we believed all that our elders and betters told us we should believe. Young Pachayan was fortunate in having a Protestant relative who witnessed for Christ to the youth while in his home in Armenia. When his brother-in-law cast the rosary beads on the ground and told him he should not pray in that manner, he was amazed at the apathy of Mary, who, he thought, ought to avenge the insult to her dignity then and there. The seed sown in his youthful mind bore fruit in due season. Christians could find an object lesson in this incident for guidance in their intercourse with Roman Catholics. A word fitly spoken, how good it is. The word of testimony for Christ will bear fruit. But we must not condone the errors of Rome while lifting up Christ before the Roman Catholics. Speak the truth in love, and the truth shall make them free.

#### The Bible as a Text Book.

The letters of the converted priest, Antonio Milanesi, which we publish this month, will attract attention by their scriptural language and fervent devotion. This young priest came to Christ's Mission the first of June, without knowledge of the English language. The Bible was placed in his hands as a text book of salvation and of our language. That he has studied it to good purpose in both respects is apparent in his letters. We have seen no more striking instance of the value of the Bible as the best guide to direct the soul to Christ and to learn the English language. Antonio's letters show that in six weeks he has acquired a large vocabulary to express his joy in finding Christ his Saviour. The God of Rome, he says, had no more power to influence his life than Baal had over the false prophets. But the God of the Christians, Jesus the loving Redeemer, has all power in heaven and on earth to make him a new creature, an heir of the Kingdom. The conversion of this young priest is a blessed event in the history of Christ's Mission, which, as Antonio says, is a cosmopolitan institution for the salvation of priests, who have been kept in gross ignorance of the good news of salvation through Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.

The learned Roman Catholic professor who came to Christ's Mission last month after wasting five years of his life preparing for the priesthood, was greatly benefited by the Northfield Conference. Like Mr. Pachayan, this was the first time he heard evangelical preaching.

Many subscribers have neglected to renew for this year, though two-thirds of the year is past. This, we would fain believe, is only thoughtlessness on their part, but it causes us much inconvenience. We hope they will not forget us altogether.

## REASONS FOR RENOUNCING ROMANISM AND WITHDRAWING FROM THE PRIESTHOOD.

BY REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

### VIII.

**T**HE priests of my native diocese, Kerry, were educated at Maynooth College, Ireland, which had been endowed by the English Government; at the Irish College, Paris, France; and at the Irish College, Rome. As the Bishop of the diocese, Dr. Moriarty, had received his clerical education in a French seminary, he wished to have some of his priests trained in a similar institution. The Irish College in Paris was as Irish as Maynooth, the professors like the students being of that nationality. Though situated in the heart of Paris, very few of the inmates of the college could speak French, and their Irish customs and manners were untouched by the influences of the refined capital of France. Dr. Moriarty perceived this, and as he was a man of broad culture, a scholar and a gentleman, he desired to have some of his priests educated in French seminaries.

It happened that I was his first choice, and when I had finished the course of rhetoric in the Killarney Seminary, I was told that I should go to the great Seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris. I had passed the examinations for the Irish College in Paris, but the Bishop preferred St. Sulpice.

I remember his letter of introduction, which was written in French, and of which the following is a translation:

*"Monsieur le Supérieur:*

"I desire to have among my clergy a priest of St. Sulpice, the foremost institution in France, if not in the world, for the education of the priests of our Church. Accordingly I send you Mr. James A. O'Connor, a pious youth who has made his preparatory studies in my Seminary and is well fitted to enter upon the ecclesiastical career. He is of good

family, devoted to the Church, and has many relatives in the priesthood in this diocese. Have the goodness to receive him with affection, Monsieur le Supérieur, and please accept the assurance of my distinguished consideration.

"DAVID MORIARTY,

"Bishop of Kerry."

The education for the priesthood was free in the Irish College in Paris and in Maynooth, where the students besides, after the first two years, received a gratuity from the Government endowment. But in St. Sulpice the students had to pay all the expenses of the Seminary—board, tuition, clothing and books. This my parents cheerfully consented to do, as they had previously paid for my education in the preparatory course. I mention this for the reason that some years ago a Roman Catholic paper in one of its rabid attacks on me, said I had misused the education I had received from the Roman Church and for which it had paid out of the offerings of the poor.

It would prolong these chapters of reminiscences to unreasonable length to enter upon the details of my life in St. Sulpice. I was only a youth of seventeen years when I presented myself to "*Monsieur le Supérieur de Saint Sulpice*" in Paris, and as I was the first student of my diocese to study there, my reception was most cordial. The Superior placed me in charge of the Abbe Hogan, an Irishman, who had been many years a member of the Society of St. Sulpice and was then professor of dogmatic theology in the Seminary. Father Hogan was, like all the Sulpicians, a gentleman in manner and very amiable. He was especially pleased to welcome me, as my Bishop was an old friend of his, and he was also acquainted with

some of my relatives who were priests in Ireland. At this time he was one of the leaders in the Seminary. Among the other offices which he filled was that of corrector of the reader in the refectory during meals. (In the Sulpician seminaries and in many other Roman Catholic institutions it is the rule for one of the students to read some work on history or the life of a saint during meals, and one of the professors is appointed to correct the pronunciation of the reader, who is usually selected from the senior class each week.) The *Anglais*, that is, the English-speaking students, were somewhat proud of the distinction conferred on Father Hogan by his appointment to this office, which required a thorough knowledge of the French language and literature. Father Hogan has since been honored by the Sulpicians in being chosen to establish a branch seminary in Brighton, Mass., for the diocese of Boston, of which he is still the president. When the Catholic University at Washington was opened a few years ago, Cardinal Gibbons selected Father Hogan to direct the spiritual affairs of the institution, but the Sulpician discipline was too much for the priests who attend the University, and he returned to Boston.

As Bishop Moriarty said in his letter of introduction, the Seminary of St. Sulpice is one of the foremost institutions in the world for the education of Roman Catholic priests, ranking with the Propaganda at Rome in numbers and the various nationalities of the students. Formerly St. Sulpice was tinged with Gallicanism and maintained the rights of the Church in France against the interference of the Roman Curia in the administration of affairs. But since the declaration of Papal infallibility it has become as ultramontane as the Propaganda or Maynooth. At present there is no opposition to papal supremacy in St. Sulpice or any of its

branches, such as St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, or the seminary at Montreal.

It was this subserviency to papal absolutism that induced Archbishop Corrigan to invite the Sulpicians to take charge of his new seminary near Yonkers, N. Y., which was opened last month. The diocesan seminary at Troy was conducted by secular priests, and a few of the professors will be transferred to the new seminary, but in time the whole staff will be composed of members of the Sulpician society.

When the seminary at Yonkers was formally opened Archbishop Corrigan said it would be distinctly an "American" institution. What he meant by that can be surmised by the title he has given to it, "The Royal Seminary of New York." Why "Royal," if it is to be a school where the principles of Americanism are to be taught? Despite the professions of Corrigan and Satolli (who was also present at the opening exercises) this new seminary will no more represent the spirit of Americanism—freedom of thought, freedom of speech, free schools and general intelligence—than do the other institutions of Rome. As a former alumnus of St. Sulpice, I shall note with interest the progress of the "Royal Seminary of New York" under the direction of the Sulpicians. Personally I have nothing but pleasant memories of the Sulpicians. As Father Hyacinthe said to me during his last visit to New York many years ago, the Sulpicians have been always gentlemen. Their teaching is of very narrow range, and their practices of devotion are most superstitious, but in personal character they are superior to the Jesuits, the Dominicans, and the other religious orders. I remember with affection my old director in Baltimore, Father Dissez. He spared no pains to make me a good priest, and I was obedient to his counsels until our merciful God opened my eyes to

the iniquity of the Roman doctrines which set at naught the things of God.

While writing these reminiscences and throwing light on the past by modern instances, a wonderful Providence has brought to Christ's Mission, the home for priests who desire to leave the Roman Catholic Church which I have established in New York, a young Sulpician who has just finished his studies in that seminary. In this issue of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* this young man, Mr. Pachayan, an Armenian by birth, relates some of his experiences in St. Sulpice, which agree in all essential points with my own. Like Mr. Pachayan, I was first sent to the Seminary at Issy, a suburb of Paris, for the study of philosophy and the sciences. The spirit and discipline of the place were the same then as now. The teaching was confined exclusively to the Roman system, both in science and philosophy, as well as in theology. We were forbidden to think on any subject except on the lines laid down by the Church. In the lectures no reference was ever made to the Bible. All deductions and conclusions were drawn from the opinions of writers approved by the Church. Discussion, which the students as young men liked to indulge in occasionally, was shut off by the dictum, "The Church has decided so and so." Narrowness and suppression of free inquiry into the causes of things mental, moral and scientific, characterized the course of study at Issy. It is the same in all Roman Catholic seminaries and colleges, and the result is seen in the almost total absence of Roman Catholic contributions to science and philosophy. From the days of Galileo to the present time the Roman Church has placed an interdict on scientific knowledge. The late Richard A. Proctor, the eminent astronomer, was forced to leave the Roman Catholic Church.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

### Work for the Conversion of Roman Catholics.

[The following is the substance of an address delivered at the Bible Conference, Northfield, Mass., August, 1896, by the Editor of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*.]

IT is sixteen years since I first came to Northfield, when the Conference was held during the entire month of August. The only building here then was East Hall, but there was a large tent on the hillside where the meetings were held, and there the Spirit of God was poured out in abundance. The saintly Dr. Andrew Bonar of Scotland was here, and Dr. Gordon and Major Whittle and Mr. Needham, and the sweet singer—to me the sweetest that ever sang the Gospel—Mr. Sankey; and other masters in Israel, pastors and evangelists were here, and elect ladies not a few—all living epistles whose testimony for Christ was a revelation to me. And the master mind that had conceived the idea of these conferences was here, as he is to-day, Mr. Moody. We see him now surrounded by the Christian schools he has established here and the thousands of devoted followers of the Lord who attend these conferences. Here are monuments of his faith, his zeal and energy, and the Christian world gives thanks to God for the labors of such a man. But to me he is the teacher of the Word of God, the pioneer in opening up the way of life for my soul.

At that time, that first conference, I had but recently withdrawn from the Roman Catholic priesthood, and what a revelation to me was the teaching of this place! Its leading characteristic was the direct personal access of the soul to God through Christ. You know I had been a priest of a Church where the activities of the soul were directed to sacraments, ceremonies and



rites as the means of grace. I did not know any other way of saving my soul but by these things; and though I administered them faithfully and used them liberally, they did not give me assurance of salvation or bring peace to my soul. Here I learned for the first time that I was justified by faith in Christ, and that through Him I had access unto the Father who would receive me as a child. I learned that wherever there was a repentant sinner there was at the same moment a seeking Saviour; and when the sinner and the Saviour came together there was the salvation of God. I could not save my soul as a priest by administering sacraments and bringing Christ down on the altar, but Jesus could, and did, and does save me by faith in Him, and in Him alone, the one Mediator between God and men, the great High Priest who offered Himself as the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. This doctrine was a revelation to me, and for it and all that through it has come into my life and directed my work I give thanks to God, and pray that His blessing might rest more abundantly upon Northfield and upon him who directs its various activities.

Since my first visit to Northfield in 1881 I have attended nearly all the Conferences, and the teaching is the same now as it was at the beginning; and the blessed experience of union with Christ and the manifestation of the power of the Holy Spirit continue to warm the heart, instruct the mind, and make the soul glow with holy fervor. During all those years I have endeavored to teach others, and especially my brethren according to the flesh, what I learned here each year. I have sought to avoid controversy and everything that would give occasion for strife, but I do not altogether avoid reference to the commandments and traditions of men that make the word of God of no

effect now as in times past. Our meetings are held in a large hall that seats one thousand persons, and many Sunday nights during the winter months it is filled with Roman Catholics and those who do not regularly attend any church. In the seasons of the year when the attendance is less, we hold our services in our own Mission chapel—Christ's Mission, on Twenty-first street, near Sixth avenue, New York. In this Mission we have a home for priests who desire to leave the Roman Church and learn the way of the Lord as the Bible teaches it. Fifty priests have come to me, and it is a great privilege to care for them, to instruct them and prepare them for the work in life they are best fitted for. Most of them, thank God, become ministers of the Gospel. After they have been tested and have given evidence of true conversion, the various seminaries receive them for more thorough training. There opportunities are afforded them for their future work. I have sent priests to Princeton, the directors of which do not forget that John Knox had been a Roman Catholic priest, for ten years before he entered upon his work for Christ. Drew Seminary (Methodist) is also open to us, and I have with me now a young Armenian priest whom I hope to send to some seminary. This year ten priests have come to me to learn the way of salvation through Christ alone.

I ask the prayers of all Christians for the Roman Catholics, and especially for the priests. These people can be reached if we carry the good news of salvation to them in the spirit of Christ. I need scarcely say that we do not meddle with the political agitation that disturbs many minds. We carefully avoid those questions at our religious meetings. I may illustrate our methods by relating an incident that occurred at one of our meetings. I was preaching on the priesthood of Christ,

and had lifted Him up as the power of God to draw all men to Himself. Then I referred to the insufficiency of a human priesthood, and how vain it was to depend upon men who called themselves priests. I said, "What would you Roman Catholics do if Almighty God should take away all the bishops, priests, and even the Pope in one moment of time?"

"Oh, then," said a woman in the audience, "we would have no one but the good God to go to."

That is just what we are trying to do in this work—bringing the people to the good God, our Saviour Jesus Christ.

#### CHRIST'S MISSION A COSMOPOLITAN INSTITUTION.

The interesting story of the conversion of the latest Roman Catholic ecclesiastic that has come to Christ's Mission, which begins in this issue of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, will be continued next month, when we will also publish his picture. He is a very intelligent, good looking young man, a master of many languages—Armenian, Turkish, French, Italian, Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Dr. Paul Pollach, the distinguished converted priest, whose portrait and farewell address at Christ's Mission appeared in the July *CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, knows three or four more languages than Mr. Pachayan; and Dr. Victor Vanoli, the converted priest from Constantinople, whose portrait and history appeared in this magazine for December, 1895, knows nearly as many. It has been truly said that Christ's Mission is a cosmopolitan institution, notwithstanding that it is so modest and unobtrusive.

Dr. Pollach is now practising his profession as a physician in Chicago, and he is deservedly meeting with great success. He is also active in mission work,

giving his services to the poor with a loving heart. Dr. Vanoli is studying medicine in Brooklyn, a gentleman of that city having offered to defray the expenses of his education for the medical profession.

The gentleman who came to Christ's Mission in June and renounced Romanism after five years' preparation for the priesthood has obtained a fine position as a professor in one of our American universities.

There are other converted priests still in the care of Christ's Mission, and as the month of August closes applications have been received from four priests who wish to take their stand on the Lord's side and declare their emancipation from Popery.

The work of the Mission is commended to the prayers of all Christians. It is conducted on conservative lines, affording a refuge and a home to priests when they are leaving the Roman Catholic Church, and leading them to know Christ as their Saviour and trust Him as their friend. During the seventeen years that this work has been carried on, FIFTY PRIESTS have been received out of the Roman Church and cared for until the Lord opened the way for them in new careers as Protestant Christians. As the work becomes better known more priests will come out of Rome, and with the blessing of God they will be received and cared for in the name of Him after whom the institution is named—CHRIST'S MISSION.

The debt on the Mission is now reduced to \$7,350. One of the promises of one hundred dollars from a good friend in Brockton, Mass., was paid last month, and fifty dollars also received. The debt ought to be wiped out this year and it will be if the friends who are interested will help as best they can.

## THE STORY OF MY LIFE AND CONVERSION.

BY REV. STEPHEN PACHAYAN.

*Translated from the French by the Editor.*

BORN in April, 1872, of Roman Catholic parents, in Marash, Cilicia, at the foot of Mount Taurus, to the north of Syria, I received my early education in my native city and made my first communion when I was eight years old. Then my parents sent me to the Armenian Catholic school in our city to prepare for the ecclesiastical career. I learned the Armenian and Turkish languages there and every morning attended church, where I had to serve several masses. There was only one Roman Catholic Church in Marash, and six or eight priests said mass there every morning. When I was eleven years old I became a member of the household of the Bishop of Marash, Monsignor Clement Makaelian, since deceased, and continued my studies under his direction.

An important event in my life was the conversion of my eldest sister to the Protestant faith, when I was twelve years old. Our parents gave their consent to her wish to unite with the Protestant Church, and for this they were excommunicated and deprived of the sacraments; and when my sister was betrothed to a Protestant young man, the priests endeavored to break off the engagement. They said her presence in our family would defile us all, and they began to persecute my parents and threaten them with all the terrible punishments of the Church in this world and the next. Notwithstanding their fanatical opposition to my sister's marriage, my mother's courage did not fail, and the marriage took place in the Protestant Church.

I consider this event one of the most providential in my life, for it was the prelude to my sympathy for Protestantism and deposited in my soul the first

germs of divine grace, which the goodness of God has brought to maturity. Before my sister's marriage I had, like all devout Roman Catholics, nothing but contempt for Protestantism; but after I came to know my brother-in-law we became good friends and frequently conversed on religious subjects. He was a good Christian, whose ardent faith and zeal for religion touched me deeply. He first showed me the evangelical faith, and then dwelt upon the absurdities of the Roman Catholic superstitions. I listened to him with respect for he was a good young man, and I knew he loved me and desired only what was good for me.

## MY ROSARY CAST ON THE GROUND.

One day as I was reciting the rosary of the Virgin Mary my brother-in-law suddenly approached, and, taking the rosary out of my hand, he threw it on the ground. I was surprised and indignant, but he only laughed in a good-natured way and said I should not pray in that manner, but with the voice and heart uplifted to God. Though at first inclined to resent his desecration of my praying beads, as I beheld them lying helpless at my feet, I could not help saying to myself: "Here is my rosary which I prize so much as a holy and sacred thing, subjected to this indignity, and my brother-in-law, whose intelligence and experience are greater than mine, has no fear to cast it away, and nothing has happened to him! Therefore it cannot possess the supernatural power which has been attributed to it by the priests." This incident affected me so much that I resolved to leave the Bishop's school, and I requested my parents to permit me to enter the Protestant college, which was much superior to the Roman Catholic



school. But my family was opposed to this step, fearing a second excommunication from the priests.

#### IN CONSTANTINOPLE.

When I was sixteen years old the Bishop decided to send me to the Roman Catholic Seminary at Constantinople, founded by Archbishop Azarian, the Patriarch of the Armenian Catholics. My parents readily consented, and in September, 1888, I entered that seminary, and pursued my classical studies there for three years, devoting myself especially to Latin and the Italian language. My professors in Constantinople were very kind and sympathetic, and I made good progress in my studies. I was appointed prefect of the school, and, possessing the confidence and respect of my professors and fellow students, I spent three happy years in that seminary.

#### AT ISSY, NEAR PARIS.

In 1891 the Patriarch Azarian summoned me to his presence and announced that he had resolved to send me to Paris, to the great seminary of St. Sulpice, to complete my studies for the priesthood. A few days before my departure he conferred on me the minor order of tonsure, and on September 10, I left Constantinople for Paris.

The studies in philosophy and science in connection with the Seminary of St. Sulpice are pursued at Issy, near Paris, and there I remained two years. My clerical training began the very day I entered the Seminary at Issy. The superior, Father Montagny, told me he would be my confessor and spiritual director, and at our first interview he required me to give a full account of my life. I obeyed him and made a general confession of all the events of my life that I could remember. When I told him that I had Protestant relatives whom I loved very much, he said I must be on my guard against them, for

if my affection for them continued they would endeavor to seduce me from the true faith and lead me into their religion. It would have been an act of disobedience for me to refuse the request of my confessor to cease to hold communication with my relatives, but notwithstanding his admonition I could not cast out of my heart the love I entertained for them.

#### THE WORSHIP OF MARY.

My progress in philosophy and the natural sciences was very satisfactory, and I pursued my studies at Issy with much ardor. The professors were very good, but the discipline and practices in the daily life of the Seminary were not calculated to produce the best results in intelligent, observant minds. The worship (*culte*) of Mary occupied the first place. To gain the greatest indulgences the students were required to prostrate themselves before such or such a statue of the Virgin placed in the corners of the garden and of the house. There was a chapel in the garden which was said to be a copy of the house of Nazareth, a reproduction of the house of the holy family, where the students assembled for a brief prayer after dinner and to which many resorted several times a day to gain the indulgences attached to it. Three smaller chapels of the Virgin Mary were also situated in the garden—the chapel of the Immaculate Conception, of our Lady of all Graces, and our Lady of Loretto. Mary had, besides, several statues with different names, such as our Lady of Mount Carmel, our Lady of Lourdes, our Lady of Victory, etc. Amid all these statues and pictures one might search in vain for Jesus Christ, the founder of Christianity. All the beauty and glory of the place were consecrated to the holy Virgin, and the most that was done for Christ was to lock him up in a box or tabernacle at the end of one of the chapels of Mary. The incongruity of

the excessive devotion to Mary and the neglect of Christ, whose ministers we were to be, had not a good effect upon me. But I hoped for better things when I should begin the study of theology.

AT ST. SULPICE, PARIS.

From Issy, I passed to St. Sulpice in Paris, and entered the class in theology with much ardor, hoping to find therein the key of all problems, and a reply to all the objections of Protestantism. The first treatise we studied was on "Religion and the true Church of Christ." When we came to the comparison of the various forms of religion, and the question, which among them deserved the name of Christian, our professor, Father Gondas, said: Protestantism, born of revolt, could give birth only to rebellion against all that was Christian and divine. Protestantism brought forth rationalism and rationalism led to atheism. Judge, therefore, said he, whether it is not absurd to give such a system the name of the religion of Jesus Christ.

My mind and heart rebelled against such a theological decision, and I could not accept the conclusions of the professor. I could not believe that an absurd and erroneous religion could produce so many millions of intelligent Christians, who were distinguished by their genius and profound knowledge; that such a religion could find acceptance among the most civilized peoples and nations of the world, such as Germany, England and the United States; that Protestantism could be the most illogical form of the Christian religion while the Protestant people were the most religious in the world. France is a Roman Catholic country, and yet it has lost all the spirit of religion. Italy is Roman Catholic; so is Spain; and they are the countries of Europe where infidelity and irreligion most prevail. I could not reconcile the statements and conclusions of the professor with existing facts.

The affirmative proofs of Roman theology regarding the Church are based chiefly on tradition, that is, oral and apocryphal stories whose origin is unknown, and which in great part were invented by the monks and sanctioned by the Council of Trent. I could not see any proof of the divine origin of the Roman Church in these traditions, and henceforth I resolved to admit only proofs drawn from Scripture. But how are the dogmas of Rome proved by Scripture? By giving us texts for the immaculate conception, the infallibility of the Pope, auricular confession, the mass, indulgences, etc. We accepted these texts without paying particular attention to them. The infallibility of Pope, which was not a dogma until the Vatican Council so declared it in 1870, was proved by the words of Our Lord to Peter. "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." But in view of Peter's subsequent denial of his Master, I could not accept this as proof of his infallibility; so, in like manner, the supremacy of Peter was not conclusive from the text: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church."

ORDAINED A SUB-DEACON.

Although the first year's study of theology did not satisfy my mind or heart, when I was called to minor orders in May, 1894, I obeyed my confessor and submitted to receive them. My second year in theology passed like the first. With the Bible in my hand I was not satisfied with the forced interpretation of the Scriptures in our text-books and by our professor of dogma, especially regarding the worship (*culte*) of saints and images. When I was called to the sub-diaconate I hesitated a long time, but at length yielded to the judgment of my confessor, who said I had a true vocation for the priesthood. I was young, I had placed my conscience, my soul, in his care, and submitting to his direction I was ordained sub-deacon in May, 1895.

## REFUSED THE DIACONATE.

And now I enter upon my third and last year of theology. To analyze my thoughts and feelings would make this sketch too long. I shall, therefore, only relate the facts as developed by the events that transpired. When, at Christmas, 1895, I was called to the diaconate I declined the call, and again when it was repeated at Trinity time this year I refused to be ordained a deacon. This double refusal caused a change in the attitude of the Seminary directors towards me. They began to watch over my conduct, and especially my relations with the Armenians in Paris. I had little intercourse with them previously; but now that I had resolved to leave the Seminary, and the scholastic year was drawing to a close, I communicated with Mr. Cayayan, a Protestant Armenian, who had been a professor in the Armenian College at Marsovan. I told him of my resolution to leave the Seminary. He sympathized with me, and promised his moral support. From our first interview I found him a devoted friend who wisely directed my steps in the new life that I desired to follow.

## LETTER TO PATRIARCH AZARIAN.

While I was preparing to leave the Seminary, suddenly a despatch came to me from the Patriarch Azarian, calling me to Constantinople to be ordained a priest. The call was urgent, and I lost no time in replying to the Patriarch as follows:

## SEMINARY OF ST. SULPICE.

Paris, June 8, 1896.

Monseigneur:

"I respectfully take the liberty to communicate to you the purpose which I have formed. It is better to obey God than man; and, therefore, in the present circumstance, my conscience tells me that to disobey the orders of your Holiness (*votre Beatitude*) is to obey the orders of God. You call me to Constantinople to receive the order of

priesthood and become a minister of the Roman Church. But my conscience tells that God requires me to remain here, to leave the Roman Church, and become a minister of the Gospel. It is not necessary for me to give further answer to your letter, as I am no longer a member of your flock."

After writing this letter I completed my arrangements for departing from the Seminary. A young Armenian who had left the Seminary two years before loaned me a secular dress and helped me to remove my baggage. He had previously introduced me to Pastor Monnier, of the Reformed Church, Paris, who was also director of the Protestant Young Men's Christian Association. This man of God received me most cordially and did all in his power to make my life happy in the new career that I desired to pursue. After some days he introduced me to Mr. Bertrand, member of the committee of evangelization in France, who greatly helped to solve the difficulties that beset me. It was he who first mentioned to me the name of Rev. James A. O'Connor and his Christ's Mission Home for priests who desire to leave the Roman Church. He said he thought Mr. O'Connor would receive me and care for me until the good God would show me my work in life. Mr. Bertrand also introduced me to Mr. Eugene Reveillaud, president of the committee of evangelization in France, who kindly wrote a fine letter recommending me to Mr. O'Connor. Thus the good providence of God opened the door of salvation for my body and soul in Mr. O'Connor's home.

## INDUCEMENTS TO RETURN TO ROME.

While Messrs. Bertrand and Reveillaud were making these arrangements for me, the Roman Catholics were active in their efforts to make me change my purpose and return to the Church. I had scarcely left the Seminary when the news

of my departure reached the ears of the directors, and one of them, Father Biell, quickly dispatched a young Armenian seminarian to convert me. My fellow-countryman came to the hotel where I was stopping, and with an embarrassed manner said to me:

"What have you done, my friend, what has come over you, you a sub-deacon of the Holy Church?"

"I have done that which my conscience told me was right. I have left the Roman Church and become a Protestant."

"You are a fool; you are mad," he said.

"Pardon me," I replied; "the fool, the madman, is he who does not know what he is doing. I know what I am doing; and I have taken this step after studying theology for three years. I pray you, therefore, to withdraw the epithet which you have applied to me."

"But" said he, "how could you make such a decision; why bring sadness upon all your friends and plunge your dear family into profound grief?"

"I have considered my course in relation to my family and friends," I replied. "But has not our Saviour Jesus Christ said, he who loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me. I have seen the truth and I love it more than anything else. Is not the salvation of the soul to be preferred above all other considerations?"

"Salvation outside the Catholic Church!" he exclaimed.

"Yes," said I, "salvation outside the Roman Church; but salvation in the Gospel, by the Gospel, and with the Gospel; that is to say, salvation by Jesus Christ."

My friend was greatly astonished at these words, and did not wish to continue the conversation. He pressed my hand at parting and looked very sad.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

## REV. ANTONIO MILANESI'S CONVERSION.

THE Italian priest with the musical name, Antonio Milanesi, who came to Christ's Mission in June, and whose interesting history and conversion were related in the July CONVERTED CATHOLIC, has found a good home for the summer with Dr. E. A. Tefft, Forestville, N. Y. Dr. Tefft had written to Pastor O'Connor several months previously, inviting him to send one of the priests converted at Christ's Mission to Forestville for the summer. A priest who had been visiting the Mission at the time this kind invitation came, offered to go to Forestville, but as he had not yet learned the way of the Lord and relied upon his own righteousness and respectability, though he condemned the Roman Church in severe terms, it was thought best not to send him until he gave better evidence of conversion. He has found employment of a congenial nature in the city, and if he will attend the meetings at the Mission there is every reason to believe that, like many others, he will there learn that he is included in the three "Alls" of Paul:

"All are under sin."

"All are gone out of the way."

"All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" and that he can be justified and made righteous only "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

As this respectable and self-righteous priest was not available, Dr. Tefft's invitation was accepted for the young priest Antonio Milanesi, who gave evidence that he was truly converted. He was delighted with the prospect of spending the summer in the country with a Christian family, and when Dr. Pollach went to Chicago, Antonio accompanied him as far as Buffalo, and thence proceeded to Forestville, where he was

most kindly received by Dr. Tefft and the other members of this Christian household.

One week after his arrival Antonio wrote a long letter to Pastor O'Connor in Latin—and it was good classical Latin—expressing his happiness at the kind reception accorded him by Dr. Tefft, and giving thanks to God for what Christ's Mission had done for him. A few sentences, translated, read as follows:

"I am greatly pleased with this quiet place. In solitude and silence God makes Himself known to souls that seek Him.

"I give you thanks, dear Father O'Connor, for sending me to such a beautiful place as this, where with all my heart and soul I can look for the kingdom of God, upon whom I have cast my care for the things that are necessary for soul and body.

"And now I know that the Lord is with you in your Christ's Mission, where I learned to love the Lord with all my heart, with all my soul, and with all my strength. Wherefore I can say with David: 'I will bless the Lord at all times: His praise shall continually be in my mouth. O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt His name. This poor man cried, and the Lord heard him and saved him out of all his troubles. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord. I cried unto Him, and the Lord healed me.'

"And now Christ lives in me and I in Him. I am His, and He is mine. His love sustains me in all things.

"With a cheerful mind I shall abide here under the care and instruction of Dr. Tefft, learning the Bible, studying the English language and helping in all the affairs of the household when necessary.

"And now I beseech you by the love of our Lord Jesus Christ that you remember me in your prayers that I might

grow in the knowledge and the love of God daily, and be used by Him in His service. I salute you with all my heart. ANTONIO MILANESI."

#### Antonio's Second Letter.

Two weeks later the following letter, written in English, was received from this converted priest:

FORESTVILLE, N. Y.,

July 6, 1896.

MY DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST:

Now I begin to comprehend how the Lord's yoke is easy, and how the help which He gives His servants is powerful.

When I was with the modern Pharisees of Rome I saw in God a severe judge, made on purpose to send our souls to hell. I saw Him all the time angry with me and ready to send me into the eternal fire, especially when I did not observe the Catholic Church's precepts. But now the scarecrow fades away, and Jesus my Saviour appears to me, like He is really, a ransom for all my trespasses. Now I see that the Lord is a very indulgent judge, who desires not the death of the sinner, but wills only that He may be converted and live; I see that the Lord is a very amorous [loving] father, who receives sweetly the prodigal son, and a careful shepherd who is continually begging the lost sheep to come to Him. Now I know how much the doctrine of self-justification may be foolish; for, being justified by Christ's blood, we shall be saved from wrath only through Him; not through fasts, watchings, confessions, hair-cloths, masses, purgatory and all the penances of the Roman ecclesiastical shop. Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Oh, I love very much Christ's



Mission and its founder, Rev. James A. O'Connor, who first illuminated my mind's darkness, and taught me the love of Jesus in my heart. I believe that if every Catholic priest might know him, very many would take refuge in Christ's Mission, to be put upon the way of truth.

And now by his help, I am at Forestville with Dr. Tefft, who attends to my instructions lovingly, assisted in it by the most patient Mrs. Freeland, who guides me into the knowledge of the faith and of the English language.

I cannot express it to them, because I am new in the study of this language, but my heart is full of gratitude to them, and I pray God in His mercy may reward them for the help and favor which I have received and am daily receiving from their loving hearts.

ANTONIO MILANESI.

Third Letter.

FORESTVILLE, N. Y.,

July 12, 1896.

REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR,

MY DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST:

Your most loving letter proves to me that you love very much my poor person, as you love all priests who wish to come into the light and seek it at the cosmopolitan Christ's Mission.

A father died in Italy who taught me that which he did not practice; while now God has given me in you a careful father who first acts helpfully and then teaches wisely; for I learned to love my Saviour at Christ's Mission, after the example shown me there, by which example you daily said to me, like Paul to the Corinthians, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." Through you Jesus has become my most familiar friend. I speak to Him and He lovingly answers me. When I was a Roman Catholic priest and invoked my God of that time, the answer came to me, like Elijah saying to the prophets

of Baal: "Cry aloud, for either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked."

This was the answer I received when I asked anything of the God of Rome; and this the answer which all Catholics receive when they pray to such a God, especially when they pray for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope who earnestly desires to see accomplished the dismemberment of my beautiful Italy, that he might again possess his awful sword. God forbid! And let us pray our God, the God of Elijah, that as all the institutions of the Middle Ages have fallen, so may fall the Papacy; and that the true High Priest, the Light of the World, Jesus Christ, may be known by all men, and that all may believe in Him, who alone is the way, the truth and the life.

Now I love my Saviour because He has heard my voice and my supplications; because He has inclined His ear to me; therefore will I call upon Him as long as I live. The sorrows of death compassed me and the pains of hell got hold upon me; I found trouble and sorrow; then I called upon the name of the Lord, and He has delivered my soul, directing me to Christ's Mission.

Therefore I will bless the Lord always, while thanking you also, dear Father O'Connor, for the counsels you have given me, which are for me like the commands of a father; and I will bind them continually upon my heart and tie them around my neck. Amen.

Please salute all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in your house.

Your brother in the Lord,

ANTONIO MILANESI.

Brother Milanese has been received into the Methodist Episcopal Church at Forestville, and will prepare for the Gospel ministry to carry the good news of salvation to his Roman Catholic people.

## AUTHENTIC HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

BY A CONVERTED ROMAN CATHOLIC PROFESSOR.

(CONCLUSION.)

**D**R. Mirbt gives some extracts from the famous work *De Consideratione*, by Bernard of Clairvaux, one of the noblest characters of the medieval Church. Bernard was a fearless man who in the work here quoted upbraided the Pope, Eugene III., with his luxury and worldliness. Strikingly does he say that Peter the Apostle did not go around covered with gold and precious stones, in costly vestments, surrounded by soldiers and shouting attendants: "As far as this is concerned, thou [the Pope] art the successor, not of Peter, but of Constantine!"

Copious documents illustrate the relations of Alexander III. and Innocent III. with the princes of their age. Among the extracts from the writings of the latter Pope is the often quoted letter in which he compares the papal and the secular power to the sun and the moon, concluding that, as the secular power derives its light from the papal see, just as the moon derives its light from the sun, thus the secular power is inferior to that of the papacy. In an epistle from the same Pope to the Patriarch of Constantinople the amazing bit of historical information is found that "James, the brother of the Lord, left to Peter not only the universal Church, but the whole world to govern!" (p. 79).

There is also here reprinted the bull of Innocent III. by which the Inquisition is ordered to proceed to "exterminate" the heresy of the Albigenses. Here again such secular rulers as do not show sufficient zeal in "purging" their realms of heresy are declared to be deposed, and "Catholics" may at once occupy their land. All in all, the bull is a fierce piece of writing.

The paragraphs concerning the here-

tics in the "constitution" of the Emperor Frederic II. (A. D. 1220) are also given. This emperor enjoys an undeserved reputation in some Protestant quarters. He quarreled with the Pope, it is true, and defied him, but it was only or chiefly from selfish motives. Any love for Christian liberty he had not, as manifested by this "constitution," which first introduced capital punishment for heresy into Germany, and did it in a form that for severity was hardly surpassed by the decrees of the Spanish Inquisition. It was not the fault of any emperor if Germany did not become a second Spain. It was due only to the sturdy love of intellectual independence of the German people themselves. They rose in indignation when Konrad of Wurzburg, in the 13th century, tried to introduce the Inquisition in its most odious form among them, killed the inquisitors or drove them away. And while they did not succeed in the long run in keeping out entirely the Dominicans (who were the leaders of the Inquisition) and their nefarious work, they repeatedly manifested that rebellious spirit which finally broke into a storm, sweeping everything before it, when Luther entered the arena.

In page 86 is found the decree of the Synod of Toulouse, in 1229, sanctioned by Gregory IX: "We forbid laymen to own the books of the Old or New Testament, . . . and most rigorously [arctissime] do we prohibit the possession of those books translated into the vernacular."

And then, pp. 88-90, is reproduced the bull "Unam Sanctam," in which Boniface VIII. summed up all the presumption, all the dizzy pride of the papacy, and did so at a time when every-

where in Europe the national feeling was beginning to bestir itself against the political claims of the Pope, as the religious feeling had long been chafing under his ecclesiastical tyranny. No other bull, probably, has been the subject of so much "interpretation" by Roman Catholic writers as this one. It is not saying too much to assert that of all the official documents of the Roman Church this is, next to the acts in the case of Honorius, the heretical Pope, the one which the adherents of the latter would the most rejoice to see forever and tracelessly wiped out of existence. Students of these matters will know what pains a man like the late Cardinal Manning took to explain away its most obnoxious features, with no success, however.

We shall try to explain to our readers why this particular bull is of such paramount importance, and so embarrassing to liberal Roman Catholics.

It is true that before Boniface VIII., other Popes had spoken in terms of immeasurable vanity of their own greatness and the comparative insignificance of secular potentates. In this very review we have furnished proof enough of this. But it had always been done either in private letters, or, as in the case of the "articles" of Gregory VII., in documents which, though doubtless claiming assent from the faithful, were not put in the form of a solemn definition of faith or morals. Now to a Protestant mind it may seem of little import whether a Pope expresses himself under one form or another, as long as he assumes a tone of authority, demanding obedience. But to the less unsophisticated intellect of educated Romanists the case is far different.

When the dogma of infallibility was discussed in the last Vatican Council, it was objected, especially by some learned German Bishops, and by the American Kenrick, that to declare the Pope infal-

lible would be to stamp as such many contradictory utterances of the pontiffs. One Pope, for instance, abolished the Society of Jesus by a public letter; another restored the same society, also by a publicly issued document. Were both these acts infallible, or neither?

Now this is how the upholders of infallibility get out of the pinch:

The suppression of the Jesuits, so they say, and thousands of other actions of the Holy See, were naught but mere transactions of current business, as it were. Just as the Pope may err in his selection of a certain architect to build a church for him, thus he may make mistakes in matters of church policy. And the question of the Jesuits was exactly a matter of policy, neither more nor less. No point of faith or morals was involved. The creed, and all the ordinances concerning the duties of Catholics toward their Church, remained the same after as before the suppression of the Society of Jesus, as well after as before its restoration.

But it is different when it comes to matters of faith or morals. Whether we are to believe that the Virgin Mary was conceived without original sin or not, or that it is permissible for priests to marry, are questions of faith and morals, and whatever decision arrived at by the Pope in this respect, must be accepted as if coming directly from God. Whoever refuses to believe them must go to hell when he dies.

Now after papal infallibility was made a dogma, the popes have been very cautious in their utterances on faith and morals. In fact, they have avoided to word their public statements in such a manner as to make of them "definitions of faith and morals." The present Pope especially has emitted nothing but harmless, neatly worded platitudes, to which few persons would ever take the trouble to refuse their consent. Take, for instance, the encyclical on the labor

question which was so ridiculously puffed and boomed by Catholic papers, and even some undenominational ones—what did it contain? Nothing but a heap of advice—well meant, perhaps, but exceedingly commonplace—for workmen not to demand more than their due, and for employers not to deprive their employees of their just wages. But not a word to define what should be understood by “just wages,” “the due of the working classes,” and the like. Socialists might have endorsed the encyclical, and the most close-fisted capitalist might have done so, inasmuch as neither of them would ever willingly admit that he demanded more than his due, or refused anybody else his.

In the Middle Ages, however, popes were far more open and direct in the use of language. And none was ever more so than Boniface VIII. In the bull “Unam Sanctam,” which is as distinctly a definition of faith and morals as anything ever issued from the Curia, he declares:

That “both the spiritual and the material sword,” that is, the executive power of both ecclesiastical and secular authorities, are “subject to the Church.” Only the Church wields the spiritual sword herself, while the material sword is wielded by the secular authorities, but exclusively for the Church. The material sword is held by the hand of kings and soldiers, but is used “at the nod and by the permission (*ad nutum et patientiam*) of the pontiff.” The secular power is to be judged by the spiritual, but the latter is responsible only to itself. The spiritual authority—that is, the papal one—is divine, given by the divine mouth to Peter, and whoever resists it resists God, And the bull winds up: “We declare, say, define and pronounce, that it is absolutely necessary for every human creature’s salvation to be subject to the Roman pontiff.”

Our readers probably by this time realize why this bull is such a thorn in the flesh of Romanists like Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland. These latter are nothing if not conciliatory and “tolerant,” that is in appearance and in their choice of words. And one of their pet phrases is: “We condemn no Protestants who are in good faith; we don’t believe such will be damned. All we ask for is that you will examine our tenets, and then, if your eyes be opened to the truth, join us.” But here, in “Unam Sanctam,” we have a bull “declaring, defining, and proclaiming” that

1. The secular rulers may use their power, especially in declaring war and making peace, only “at the nod and by the permission of the Roman pontiff.”

2. All human beings that do not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, are damned.

If Boniface had written this in a private letter, the harm would not have been so great, as he would then not be supposed to “define” anything. But a bull is something irrevocable and not to be explained away.

We close the extracts from Dr. Mirbt’s book with some quotations from Urban VIII.’s bull “In Coena Domini,” issued April 1, 1627. It is reprinted from the *Magnum Bullarium Romanum* (an official Roman Catholic publication) Vol. V., pp. 125-28. No one can accuse its author of ambiguity of language. He certainly does not mince matters.

“We excommunicate and anathematize, on the part of Almighty God, by authority of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, all Hussites, Wycklifites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and the apostates from the Christian faith, and all and every one of the other heretics, by whatever name they may be called, and

whichever sect they belong to, and those who believe in them, receive them, favor, and in general defend them, and who read knowingly their heretical books, or such as treat of religion, without our authorization and that of the Apostolic See, and those who own these books, print them, or in any manner defend them, for whatever reason, publicly or secretly, &c., &c."

This is from the first paragraph, and seems enough to take even a Pope's breath away; but in justice to Urban it must be said that once started in the cursing business he was capable of a long and sustained effort. The second paragraph repeats the substance of the first, in a little different words, including "universities and colleges," (heretical ones, of course) in the anathema. And then "His Holiness" goes on through 25 more paragraphs, cursing, cursing, cursing. Here are "excommunicated and anathemized" all those that "personally or by others, directly or indirectly, under whatever pretext or pretension, undertake to invade, destroy, occupy and hold, wholly or in part, Rome, the kingdom of Sicily, the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, &c., &c.;" in short, all those states that were long misruled by the so-called successor of St. Peter, but then piecemeal slipped out of his hands.

And to no one concerned, be he Lutheran, Calvinist or Garibaldian, should it be a small matter that all and every one included in this very comprehensive excommunication may only be absolved by the Roman pontiff himself, unless he be dying. And even then there would be so many formalities to go through, that the present writer, for one, feels uncomfortably assured that hardly one in a thousand would be able to comply with them. And having revealed to our Protestant readers this awful prospect, we shall leave them to ponder over it for themselves.

## CARDINAL MANNING.

### REVIEW OF HIS LIFE.

#### FOURTH ARTICLE—MANNING A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

MANNING'S biographer, Mr. Purcell, has placed at the opening of his second volume, which treats of Manning as a Romanist, a letter from Cardinal Wiseman, Manning's predecessor as Archbishop of Westminster, to Father Faber, the Oratorian. Although not directly touching upon the life of Manning, the letter contains so much that is characteristic of the inner life of the Roman Church that our readers will be thankful for getting some extracts from it.

Wiseman is complaining of want of priests. Everywhere in England, he states, Roman Catholics are without ecclesiastical care and consequently falling away from their Church. When the reader keeps in mind that this, according to the tenets of the Church of Rome, means eternal destruction, the following lines from the Cardinal's letter will help him to appreciate the much lauded "zeal" of Roman Catholic monastic or priestly orders. The extracts are from pp. 3-9 of Vol. II. of the Life.

"The local clergy cannot keep it [missionary work among the poor] up . . . I therefore spared no pains to secure missionary communities, to help in the work of evangelizing the poor . . . When I came to London, there was not a single community of men. There were two Jesuits in a house; that was all. Now it is different.

"1. The Jesuits have a splendid church, a large house, several priests . . . we have under them a church which by its splendor attracts and absorbs the wealth of two parishes, but maintains no schools, and contributes nothing to the education of the poor at



its very door. I could say much more, but I forbear.

"2. The Redemptorists came to London as a missionary order, and I cheerfully approved of and authorized their coming. When they were settled down I spoke to them of my cherished plan of missions to and among the poor. I was told this was not the purpose of their Institute *in towns*, 'and that another order would be required for what I wanted' . . . . They have exerted no local influence, and though lately they have offered to work among my poor (being no longer in the diocese), something seems to have paralyzed their efforts.

"3. The Passionists I brought first to England . . . . I got them placed at Aston Hall . . . . I gave them a house . . . . they have never done me a stroke of work among the poor . . . .

"And now, last, I come to the Institute, of which I almost considered myself a member, San Filippo's Oratory [of which Faber as well as Newman was a member] . . . . As a matter of fact, you know that external work, the work I have been sighing for, is beyond its scope . . . . you remember the principle you once quoted to me as St. Philip's definition of Oratorian duties: 'that others hunt, but you must stay at home and fish.' This is quite right, but sometimes, I think, had dear San Filippo's lot not been cast in happy Rome, the source of faith, the center of unity, with a copious staff of parochial clergy . . . . but in naughty London, heretical, schismatical, vicious, depraved, ignorant, profane . . . . would his great heart have stood it, and would he not have rushed out into streets and lanes . . . . ?"

What a terrible indictment of the religious orders is this letter! Catering to the rich only, caring nothing for the poor at their very door, using the plea of "Rule" as a screen behind which to

hide whenever they are urged to do the rough work in the Lord's vineyard! And this is the testimony of a Roman Catholic Cardinal in behalf of those very orders that deluded Protestants occasionally hold up for the admiration and imitation of their unsophisticated brethren!

In order to remedy the defect's pointed out by Wiseman. Manning, not long after his return from Rome, where he studied some time after his "conversion" and admission to the Roman Catholic priesthood, established at Bayswater a community of missionary priests, called the Oblates of St. Charles. The community was a branch of an older one in Italy, and the frequent journeys Manning had to make to Rome and other Italian cities, on this account, brought him into frequent contact with Cardinals and other high ecclesiastics, including Pope Pius himself. Thus he acquired an intimate knowledge of their peculiar ways, and, being himself cut out for a diplomat, he soon became an adept in the pulling of the "sacred" wires of the Roman Church. As he himself said long afterwards (II., p. 2), "All this led to my becoming what I am now."

The inner life of the Roman Church did not always please Manning. "Thank God," he wrote in 1860 to his staunch friend, Mgr. Talbot, an English convert and chamberlain to Pope Pius (II., 101), "thank God the Protestants do not know that half our time and strength is wasted in contests *inter domesticos fidei* (among the members of the household of faith) . . . . This is very grievous and must displease God." Mgr. Talbot answers: "I can see how the progress in piety . . . . in conversions, etc. [he means in England] has been in spite of the rulers of the Church, and the priests who used to be looked upon as oracles . . . . The priests in England . . . . are good

men, but prejudice and jealousy are the failings of good men ; all the religious orders have them in a high degree."

Thus there is ample testimony in Manning's biography that his life within the Roman fold was not one of unalloyed bliss. However, for many years he knew how to turn the very faults of which he complained to good account for himself. Pope Pius, who was of an impressible and impulsive nature, had always had a liking for Manning since the day when the latter, *while still an Anglican Archdeacon*, knelt in a public square at Rome while the Pope was passing by. And the shrewd Englishman knew how to work on the Pope's sympathies. Besides, in Mgr. Talbot, who was a great favorite with Pius, Manning had a fanatic admirer who used his far-reaching influence to further Manning's plans.

The great object of Talbot and Manning was to root out the "English spirit" which they found prevailing among Catholics in England and replace it with a "Roman spirit." "I see much danger," wrote Manning in 1866 to Talbot, "of an English Catholicism, of which Newman is the highest type . . . It takes the line of deprecating exaggerations, foreign devotions, ultra-montanism, anti-national sympathies." And Talbot chimes in : "Continue to stand forward as the advocate of Roman views in England . . . You will have battles to fight, because every Englishman is naturally anti-Roman. To be Roman is to an Englishman an effort. Dr. Newman is more English than the English. His spirit must be crushed."

While reading this, one can hardly help substituting "American" for "English" all the way through. As much as every Englishman, every American is naturally anti-Roman. And there are, at this present hour, prelates here in America, like Gibbons and Ireland, who ostentatiously deprecate

"exaggerations, foreign devotions,\* ultra-montanism, anti-national sympathies." But we learn here from those who for years lived at the very fountain-head of Roman Catholicism, that the spirit of such men "must be crushed." And it is just a little difficult to believe that the ecclesiastics who in our country and to this day profess a kindred spirit, should be ignorant of the fact that by doing so they oppose the true Roman doctrine. There is a German proverb which informs us that "mice are caught with bacon." Somehow it would seem that Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, realizing exactly what kind of bacon is likely to attract American mice had got permission from Rome to use it here for a bait, while in secrecy they assured their superiors at the Vatican of their own sound "Roman spirit." Gibbons and Manning were on quite friendly terms, and doubtless the latter vouchsafed to the former more than one piece of precious advice.

But to return to our subject : Manning devoted much of his time and energy to the demolishing of Newman, and to a great extent he succeeded. People who have only an outside knowledge of the Roman Catholic Church, and especially of its life and doings in England during the present century, are wont to look upon Newman and Manning as co-workers and friends. At the funeral of Newman, a few years ago, Manning shed many tears and spoke copiously of his love and friendship for the dead Cardinal. But somehow equivocating comes easier than anything else to Roman lips, and the truth was vastly different from what one would judge it to be from Manning's address on that occasion. The plain facts in the case are best stated in the words of the parties themselves :

\*The late Bishop of Springfield, Mass., O'Reilly, sturdily refused to set up a statue of "The Sacred Heart" in his Cathedral, because he was opposed to this "foreign devotion."

This is from a letter of Newman's to Manning, of August 10, 1867 (II., 305):

"I say frankly . . . that it is a distressing mistrust which now for four years past I have been unable in prudence to dismiss from my mind, and which is but my own share of a general feeling (though men are slow to express it, especially to your immediate friends) that you are difficult to understand. I wish I could get myself to believe that the fault was my own . . ."

And here is Manning's answer:

"I have felt in you exactly what you felt in me, and that feeling I share also, as you say, with others . . . I feel with you, that the root of the difficulty is a mutual mistrust, and, as you say, this is hard to cure."

"No attempt," adds Mr. Purcell [II., p. 306], "was ever hereafter made on either side to restore lost confidence. They never wrote or spoke again in terms of intimacy." Letters did pass between them after this, though—chiefly on account of Manning's desire to make it possible at least to keep up appearances of good-will between them. He saw more and more that Newman was much more truly beloved by English Catholics, and esteemed even by Protestants, than he himself could ever hope to be. It therefore struck him as good policy not to make the breach between them wider than absolutely inevitable, and to carry on his work of undermining Newman as secretly as possible. Hence he tried to explain to Newman that his coolness toward him was caused by his belief that certain public attacks on him (Manning) originated with the famous Oratorian, and that on having been assured that this was not so, he entertained nothing but the most friendly feelings towards the latter. But Newman could not be made to believe that Manning was sincere, and a letter which remained for many years his last

to his former friend, closes in the following manner:

"It avails not . . . to assure me of your deliberate conviction of all this . . . . Meanwhile, I purpose to say seven masses for your intention amid the difficulties of your ecclesiastical duties."

To which Manning replied (II., 341):

"I am much obliged by your kind intention of saying mass for me, and I shall have great pleasure in saying one every month for your intention during the next year. I have more confidence in this than in anything else to bring about what we desire."

When one knows what Manning's action in regard to Newman continued to be for years after this—in fact, up to the day when the present Pope once for all closed the question by making Newman a Cardinal—one is forcibly reminded by these promises of masses of an old medieval anecdote: A certain king had long had a quarrel over a piece of land with the abbot of a great monastery. At last the king called on the abbot and offered to settle matters in a peaceful manner. "If you allow me the use of the land while I live," he said, "I promise to leave it to the monastery by will when I die." To this the abbot agreed, and the reconciliation was celebrated with a splendid supper in the refectory of the monks. "Stay over night," said the abbot to the king, "and to morrow morning I will celebrate high mass for your intention!" The king was delighted and stayed for mass, during which he received communion. Shortly after he was taken violently ill and was put to bed. The abbot entered the room and looked searchingly at the sick king. "Abbot," said the latter, "I believe you have poisoned me." "And even if it were so," replied the abbot, "I might have done it with a good conscience, for is it not your intention to go to heaven,"

and to leave me the piece of land we have so long been at loggerheads over?" "Certainly," admitted the king. "Well, don't you see that by poisoning you I help you to accomplish both these ends much sooner than would otherwise have been possible?"

It is not known what the king answered, nor whether the abbot had really and truly put poison in his food, or, perhaps, in the consecrated wafer which he handed him at communion, nor is the writer able to vouch for the historical truth of the story, which is one of the tales of the monks. But it embodies strikingly that duplicity which is one of the most odious characteristics of so many Roman Catholic prelates and priests, and of which the late Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster possessed his ample share. After writing to Newman that he would say a monthly mass for his intention, he did nothing but thwart the latter in all his plans. Probably he meant thereby either to shorten Newman's days, and thus bring him into heaven as soon as possible, as he intended by humiliating him to make him abandon his independent ways.

The trouble with Newman was twofold. In the first place he believed in Catholics mingling with members of other denominations, and especially in their getting as good an education as Protestants. For this reason he advocated that they study at Oxford—under the superintendence of Roman Catholic teachers, of course. He even went so far as to buy an expensive piece of ground at Oxford, upon which he wanted the Oratorians to build a house in which Catholics studying at the University might get advice from priests of their own church. But Manning crushed the whole scheme and Newman was compelled to sell the ground.

The other "crime" of Newman's was his disbelief in papal infallibility, Man-

ning's pet dogma. When the latter, in conjunction with the Jesuits whom in all other respects he hated and detested, was agitating the Catholic world in order to have the infallibility publicly proclaimed a dogma by a council, Newman wrote a letter to his bishop—Ullathorne of Birmingham—strongly deprecating any such action. He also was antagonistic to the temporal power of the Popes [II., 348]. All of which Manning deemed rank heresy.

The consequence was that by far the larger part of Newman's life in the Roman Catholic Church was one continuous series of worries, blows and slights. It is to be regretted that Mr. Purcell does not tell us of the attempt to have Newman publicly condemned by the Inquisition and his books put on the Index which, as a matter of fact, was made during the latter years of the reign of Pius IX. Doubtless Manning must have had a hand in that also. It was only frustrated by the timely intervention of some English Catholic nobleman who represented to the Pope the irreparable mischief that would be caused by the condemnation of the most illustrious convert Rome ever acquired in modern times.

Mr. Purcell relates enough, however, for his readers to realize the boundless animosity of Manning against Newman, and the latter's countless tribulations. "The greatest calamity that ever befell the Catholic Church in England," said Manning's friends, "was John Henry Newman's conversion." To which it is reported that Canon McMullen, a friend of the Oratorian, retorted: "No, the greatest calamity was the death of a woman (Mrs. Manning)."

Be this as it may, as long as Pius IX. was still living, Manning passed from triumph to triumph. In 1865 he was made successor to Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster, and in 1875 as a fit reward for his services dur-

ing the Vatican Council he received the Cardinal's hat. That the proclamation of the infallibility of the Pope as a dogma was the move of Manning more than any other one man, has long been well-known. But there is a fact connected with his diplomatic machinations during the council which is so characteristic of Roman Catholic morals and customs that we must relate it here :

All the prelates who participate in an ecumenical council are bound by solemn oath not to reveal to any outsiders whatsoever one syllable of what takes place in the council. The Holy Ghost is supposed to preside invisibly over the proceedings, and it is a matter of the greatest importance that nothing should leak out before all is finally settled. But in order to be able to mould public opinion in favor of the new dogma, Manning obtained of Pius IX. a release from the oath of secrecy [II., 433], thus being put in a position to communicate whatever he pleased of the council's transactions to Mr. P. C. Russell, the diplomatic agent of the English Government at the Vatican. Russell, although himself a Protestant, was the son of a Catholic mother and in thorough sympathy with the "infallibilists," as Manning and his supporters were styled. Through him everything of importance concerning the work of the council was divulged, not only to the English Government but to the leading European newspapers as well. This singular "giving away of the Holy Ghost's secret" forms a stirring testimony to the peculiar standard of honor held by the Roman Church.

While thus it was natural Manning should be honored by the Pope, his promotion was by no means obtained without much scheming and intriguing. Cardinal Wiseman for years before Manning rose into prominence had by his side as coadjutor-bishop, with right of succession, Dr. Errington.

This prelate was a good living and scholarly man of moderately if not positively liberal views, and of a consequence hateful to Manning. The latter succeeded in making Pope Pius suspect Errington, and in 1862 the coadjutor was compelled to resign. It was feared, though, that upon the death of Wiseman, Errington and his friends would again renew his claims—something that actually afterwards did happen. Through his satellite Talbot, Manning therefore kept dinning into the Pope's ears that Errington was a haughty and unruly man who had spoken disrespectfully of the Holy Father, etc. There is a very amusing page in the "Life" (II., 216), which tells of an audience one of Manning's tools, the Redemptorist (afterwards bishop) Coffin had with Pius in 1865, shortly after the death of Wiseman.

"What a pity that Cardinal Wiseman is dead!" said the Pope, and then added: "But who will now be Archbishop?" Father Coffin answered: "Dr. Errington is talked of." Upon this Pius IX. cried out: "That would be an insult to the Pope. ! Isn't that so?" . . . Then Manning himself says, the Pope beat his breast thrice with indignation. After a while he added: "But there is Mgr. Clifford (Bishop of Clifton, he was also suggested for the Archbishop's see), and then," as if checking himself, said: "But let us leave all that to the Holy Ghost!"

From the evidence given in the book before us there can be no doubt that, in Roman Catholic parlance, the Holy Ghost stands for the wire-pullers at the Vatican. For it was they, and above all, the head and leader of the Manning faction, Mgr. Talbot, who settled the matter. On the 8th of April Father Coffin wrote to Manning [II., 213]:

"The displeasure at what has occurred in the chapter (the chapter of Westminster, which had proposed Er-



rington for the vacant see) and elsewhere, is extreme at Propaganda. . . . Mgr. Talbot is saying mass every day for this intention." It is left somewhat in the dark by Coffin what is meant by "this intention," but a letter from Mgr. Talbot printed a little further on [II., 220] gives all the information needed:

"My policy," writes the Monsignor, "throughout was never to propose you (Manning) *directly* to the Pope, but to make others do so; so that both you and I always can say that it was not I who induced the Holy Father to name you, which would lessen the weight of your appointment. . . . I do not say that the Pope did not know that I thought you the only man eligible, *as I took care to tell him over and over again what was against all the other candidates*, and in consequence *he was almost driven into naming you*. After he had named you the Holy Father said to me: 'What a diplomatist you are to make, what you wished come to pass!' Nevertheless, I believe your appointment was specially directed by the Holy Ghost [!!!] . . . . Every free mass I offered up for you; but at the same time I told them all that I thought you had no chance, in order to silence them."

Would it be possible to invent anything at one and the same time more disgusting and yet so ludicrous, as the mixture of low cunning and equally low "piety," contained in Mgr. Talbot's letter? Nevertheless, Manning was delighted with it, as may be seen from his answer in which occurs the following phrase (II., 222): "Before all I must express my sense of your uprightness." Uprightness, indeed!

It goes without saying that, after this, the friendship of Manning and Talbot appeared more firmly cemented than ever. We use the expression "appeared" advisedly. For the very same Mgr. Talbot complained afterward bit-

terly that when no longer needing his help, Manning neglected him (II., 696, note). And more than that: When in 1868 Talbot's mind gave way and he was removed to an asylum at Passy, Mr. Purcell tells us that Cardinal Manning made no allusion even to the calamity. In like manner, on Mgr. Talbot's death, there is no record of the event [that is, in Manning's diary]. In fact, it looks as though the great Cardinal was as anxious to wipe out every trace of the memory of poor Talbot, as he was to efface all reminders of the life and death of his Anglican wife. And he let Talbot rot away in the insane asylum and, later, in his obscure grave without a word or tear of regret.

The fact was, Manning possessed one other trait as characteristic as his duplicity, an enormous egotism. Everything and everybody else must work for him, be sacrificed to him, if need be, but he alone was to have the credit for whatever was in the end accomplished. And as long as people complied with these arrogant demands of his, he would tolerate, perhaps even flatter them. But if they dared to object to being trod upon, he would at once try to crush them. And such as lost their usefulness for him, might expect naught but the silence of oblivion.

In this we also find the reason for his change of attitude toward the Vatican. We have shown elsewhere [in the article on "Bliss and Capel" in the August CONVERTED CATHOLIC] how bitter were, at a late period in his life, Manning's utterances against the papal court and even such high authorities as the Holy Office [the Inquisition]. But while he had ample reason to be disgusted, yet we cannot help observing that it was only when, under Leo XIII., his influence in the Vatican had vanished, and consequently things did not all come his way, that he spoke out about the shameful abuses and injustice

of the Roman Curia. Not until the shoe pinched himself, did he confess that there was any shoe at all. For what, after all, was his chief complaint against Pope Leo's government?—that it was slow to take action against that prelate of scandalous records, Mgr. Capel. But was Capel's life any worse than that of Cardinal Antonelli, whose illegitimate children quarrelled over his estate after his death? It is beyond controversy that Antonelli's character was known all over Rome in his lifetime. Yet Pope Pius retained him as his right hand up to the end of his days, showering wealth and honor upon him. And never a syllable of reproach came from Manning's lips anent this.

A similar view we feel constrained to take of Manning's so-called reformatory work of his last years. We are not his judge, and we shall not try to deny that by contact with energetic Protestant reformers he came to realize and sympathize with the frightful sufferings of the poor of London. But we cannot forbear thinking that vanity had a good deal to do with his entering the field of reform. He saw that he had got all he possibly could from Rome, and then turned his restless energy and powerful hand to other realms where glory might be won. Biographer Purcell tells us, and Mr. W. T. Stead recently in the New York "Independent" confirms, that during the concluding years of Manning's life he had little but purely official relations with his clergy, and hardly any at all with the Catholic laity. His mind also in memory reverted to his Protestant days; he delighted in recalling incidents from his Anglican life.

Thus his life, as it were, became once more Protestant, and whatever good he accomplished by his humanitarian work was in nowise due to his Roman Catholic belief or associations. While this, in a sense, may be considered gratifying, yet it is impossible to look upon it with

any great satisfaction. For he remained in the Roman Church, used his ecclesiastical authority as sternly as ever when opportunity offered (for instance in shutting Catholics out from the Protestant universities—lately his successor has prevailed on the Pope to repeal this prohibition), and all in all remained up to his death the same imperious, egotistic, scheming and double-dealing prelate. And now he is dead, and the records of his life have been laid before the public. They form one of the most interesting biographies ever written, and teach more than one valuable lesson; but that of respect for the Roman system and its unholy, scheming, wicked leaders is not among them. The biography of Manning will *open the eyes* of many thinking Roman Catholics to the hollow mockery of the "religion" of these leaders. In his heart Manning was a Protestant Christian for many years before his death, but his pride would not let him proclaim to the world that he had made a mistake when he "went over to Rome." It is significant that for the last ten years of his life he never visited Rome—after the Capel incident in 1883.

The publication of this biography has caused consternation in the Roman ranks in England and this country, especially among the Protestants who became Romanists. They had blindly followed the example of Newman and Manning without knowing why, except that it was a "fad" among Episcopalians to go over to Rome because those men had taken that step. Now they are mortified and humiliated by the revelations which Mr. Purcell, one of themselves, has given to the world. With lying lips and venomous hearts these high priests of Rome pretended to offer up daily Christ on the altar, and then proceeded to settle the affairs of the Church with as much diplomatic rascality as was ever exhibited in any European court. Many of those former Protestants will now return to their former Church.

## SACERDOS VAGABUNDUS; OR, THE TRAMP PRIEST.

BY REV. J. H. O'BRIEN, FORMERLY VICAR-GENERAL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF FORT WAYNE, INDIANA.

## III.

## TREATMENT OF TRAMP PRIESTS — EX-EATS.

THE manner in which Bishops treat suspended priests forces us to the conclusion that they believe there is no hope of reformation in these men, and consequently no eternal salvation for them; that their sins are of a kind that can neither be forgiven in this world nor the world to come.

The Bishops not only refuse absolutely to provide them with a place of refuge, but positively and persistently forbid superiors of religious orders to receive them into their monasteries. Sometimes the Bishop, after suspending a priest, gives him an *exeat*, that is a paper declaring him to be a priest free from all censure, and recommending him as a worthy and faithful clergyman. The Bishop's excuse for telling this falsehood in the *exeat* is that he wishes to quietly get rid of such a priest, but takes care to inform privately any Bishop to whom that priest may apply, of his previous character. And though the granting of such letters is forbidden by a decree from Rome, still our Bishops with their usual respect for Rome's decrees, grant them, and the end of it all is that the poor fellows with their "papers," must become tramps just the same as those from whom, out of respect to Rome's decree, the *exeat* is withheld. They have now no home, no means of support, for in the days of their prosperity they made not to themselves friends of mammon, they stored not up against the evil day, which is come upon them. But why should they become tramps? Why not put their education to some account, and turn their hand to earn an honest and independent living. In the first place, under pain of excom-

munication they are forbidden to enter secular employment, for though suspended, the Church ever recognizes them as priests, and requires them to comply with all sacerdotal obligations. Again, even were they willing to seek some secular position, most of them would find it impossible to get employment, for they have never received a business education.

Having been from the beginning intended for the Church, their whole course of studies consisted of those things which a clerical life required them to know. The ministerial life is the only one they are capable of filling, and to such as could conscientiously do so the very best thing would be for them to seek admittance into some Protestant denomination, where if they behave themselves and lead a good and moral life they will soon regain as much and more than they have lost. And there they will be able to comply with their vocation by preaching and teaching the people to do good and seek the kingdom of Heaven. Many Catholic priests have done this; more indeed than those who know, care to acknowledge. Many quiet, peaceable men make no hurrah over their change. They do better both for soul and body, and for good example and Christianity, than to tramp the country in black despair. The hope of being restored to their former position in the Church encourages many to bear up against their cruel treatment, and they manage to worry out a miserable existence by subsisting on the charity of the poor; for be it known that rich Catholics never help them, preferring to give of their abundance to the priest who needs not their assistance, but who can publish their generosity to the congregation from the altar.

But by far the grand majority of suspended priests go down among the tramps, and become like unto them; not all at once, however, but by degrees they descend lower and lower, losing all self respect; hardened in despair, they cast off all sacerdotal semblance, they lose all faith, become downright infidels. Of this class we have seen some in the prisons on Ward's Island and Blackwell's Island, New York. They may also be found in the poorhouses and workhouses throughout the land, to the eternal and monstrous shame and discredit of the Catholic Church which makes no provision for the reformation of those whom she has segregated from the world by the sacrament of orders and into whose hands she has put almost divine power; for the Church holds and teaches that no suspension or degradation whatsoever can remove the indelible character imprinted on the soul by the sacrament of orders. And no matter how bad, how low, how guilty a priest may be, whether suspended or excommunicated, he can validly administer the sacraments—his consecration of the most holy sacrament is as valid as would be that of the Pope himself. Remember this is not our teaching, but is that which is held and taught by the Roman Catholic Church. Any tramp priest may pronounce the words of consecration over bread and wine, and forthwith Transubstantiation takes place. Though we shudder at the thought of such sacrilege, nevertheless, we may not deny the fact; the Sacrament is complete and the bread and wine are now the body and blood of Jesus Christ. One would think that the Church should deny this power to suspended priests or compel the Bishops to be cautious in sending forth as tramps men invested with such fearful capacity for good or evil. The knowledge that the Church does recognize this power in them ought to teach Bishops that, having or-

daind a man a priest, they should be obliged to provide for him, as he remains always and under every circumstance a priest, retaining the full power of the priesthood though inhibited from its use.

The State of New York provides reformatories for the most forsaken of its citizens, even for drunkards, and many of these poor fellows are cured and restored to society, often becoming honored, useful members of the community. Corporations are said to have no souls, but in this they show more willingness to assist their unfortunate members, than the Church does which claims to be all spiritual, all charitable. Can it be that the Bishops consider their subjects incorrigible? or do they believe it impossible to reform a sinful priest? If a Bishop were himself suspended the first time he committed a fault, or if he received the mitre on condition that he should never sin, how few could retain it for any length of time, and how many tramp-bishops would there be? If there is no pardon for sin, why keep the confession boxes in the Church? Why preach that though your sins are red as scarlet, by confession, penance and sorrow they are washed as white as snow? What bigotry for poor sinful man to judge his fellow being guilty of damnation, and irrevocably lost, and to do all in his power to drive the unhappy wretch into the very gates of hell! Not a kind word, not a hand stretched out to stay his downward course. Cold, stern words of reproach and condemnation from his Bishop; contempt, sneering and scorn from his former associates and equals; cruel indifference from all who could assist him; the pity and charity of the poor alone left to sustain him; what wonder that his course is rapid to despair and ruin, and that with shame and confusion he vainly strives to hide himself as a tramp-priest.

## IV.

APPEALS TO ROME—HOW TO ADDRESS  
THEM—DISUNION AMONG THE  
CLERGY.

During the past twenty years we have met with very many suspended priests, and always taking a deep interest in them, we have listened with sorrow to their complaints. We heard their story with no idle curiosity, but with a hope of being some day able to minister to their sufferings, and for this purpose we now make their grievances known, hoping to interest others in their welfare. If our style appears somewhat rough, and if sometimes we may be accused of using harsh language or insulting epithets towards the Bishops, our excuse is that this cry of distress has gone up so long unheeded from these friendless outcasts, that we are determined to knock loud enough in their behalf to secure them a hearing, and endeavor to make their lordships, the Bishops, (God bless them!) feel somewhat ashamed of the part they have taken in the ruin of these men; and though our wish is to please all, yet we are so independent as not to care who is offended, while we in charity hold out our hands to befriend the subjects of episcopal tyranny and injustice. Our motive is good; our way of expressing ourselves is intended to be the most forcible and plain that we know how to use. No squeamishness nor fear shall prevent us from showing that the whole system of suspending priests and of treating them afterwards is most pernicious, and calculated to bring ruin eternal on men who, under a proper method of discipline, could be saved and restored to usefulness, instead of making them, as they are, the shame and dishonor of the Church. Let the blame be placed where it belongs—with the Bishops, who are as ready to ordain as suspend, and who make as little inquiry into the

qualifications of candidates for orders as they do into the accusations against those whom they suspend. Let parents be impartially informed of all; and let boys be told in time what they have to expect if they become priests. Every priest knows, and every student should be taught, that the Bishop is bound by no law to give any reason whatever to any one for suspending a priest. His will is paramount; his ipse dixit is sufficient. Rome alone can require the cause for him. The Bishop is human; he can give Rome any reason he likes. Who is to know what he answers? He will naturally justify himself. The person suspended, of course, may have recourse to Rome. It is a pity that all such priests do not appeal their cause to Rome. Of the numbers of suspended priests with whom we have conversed very few had the least notion of seeking redress at Rome. Many of them were under the impression that it might injure their case, fearing to incur the further displeasure of the Bishop, or doubting of a favorable hearing before the tribunal of the Propaganda. Now the fact is, and we speak from our own experience, that they would be received kindly, and heard with patience, humility and charity by the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. Their case would be thoroughly investigated, many a fault passed over, when they appear properly disposed, and whatever may account in their favor bountifully allowed; and though it will take time, for they work slowly there, in the end they may be sure they will obtain a just decision. Many of our Bishops have discovered to their sorrow that it does not pay to interfere with the clergymen who know how to go to Rome. Another thing we observed while in Rome: that the Cardinal received with affability the poor priests who sought his protection or demanded justice, while towards our Bishops he was cold, stern, dignity per-



sonified, treating them respectfully, yet distantly and formally. Indeed, it seemed to us that the Cardinal took a sly pleasure in humbling them, in taking the starch of pride and bombast out of them; and however great they feel themselves here, where they can do as they please, they are obsequious enough while under his eye. We actually saw the Bishop who went over with the American pilgrimage made fun of, and his Latin criticised and ridiculed by the Cardinals in the very presence of the Pope himself; and though he has a good voice for shouting at his poor priests here, he was silent enough there. But not every priest has means to go to Rome, and this is a great misfortune, since letters can never represent and explain their trouble so well as themselves in person; nevertheless, they should write, every one of them. It would cause some lively times if every suspended priest in the United States would lay a full statement of his cause before the court of Rome. Such a coming and going of Bishops across the Atlantic would be quite exhilarating to witness, and more than one mitre would be removed from proud, ambitious, self-seeking heads, and given to venerable, noble, worthy men, competent to govern and judge their dioceses. The care of the Church in this country is intrusted to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda at Rome, and to him all communications concerning it should be addressed. It is almost certain that he is not fully informed of the manner in which our Bishops govern, or to speak plainly, misgovern in this country. The clergy are to blame in not informing him of the outrages and scandals committed by our Bishops in the exercise and arbitrary abuse of the power which they have gradually assumed and confirmed to each other. A priest, be his character ever so good, has no rights, absolutely none, which the Bishop is bound to respect; he may at any moment be suspended with or without cause. How long will the priests of America stand this? Just so long as they are disunited and cannot agree

among themselves. So long as they are jealous of one another. So long as they seek their own and not the Church's welfare. One has a good parish, another wants it, and leaves nothing undone to put that one out and himself in. Not long ago a prominent pastor of Philadelphia lay at the point of death; his neighbor could not wait for death, but hastened off to the Bishop to make application for the parish; the sick man recovered, however, and hearing of his friend's doings, naturally felt a little cold towards him afterwards. Every Bishop will tell you of similar cases of frequent occurrence in his diocese.

Without charity or kindness priests disseminate strange and prejudicial stories of one another, exaggerating each other's failings and by sly insinuations deprecating their brother's good works, vainly imagining thus to enhance the value of their own. Altogether they conduct themselves towards each other as laymen of the same trade do, of whom it is said, they can never agree. Thus disunited and suspicious they give authority to the Bishop to rule them with an iron hand, and frequently furnish him the scourge where-with he beats them.

While the priests seek self above all, and make the acquisition of riches their chief desire, and while they trample on the rights of others, they may expect a continuation of the present system. If they were united as a band of brothers, helping and advocating one another's cause, they could force the Bishops to promulgate a secure system of Church discipline; for after all, the priests and not the Bishops are the power in this country. Were discipline established according to Canon law suitable to the wants of this country, every priest would have a fair chance, according to his deserving, and no priest would ever want; the clerical tramps would not exist; priests would hold their parishes and enjoy in old age the fruits of the labors of their youth; they would then have no need of forever tipping their sermons with a silver tail, begging, collecting, and stowing away, always anxious to lay by something to live upon when that fatal suspension comes.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

---

**MONASTIC LIFE—FATHER HARRINGTON'S CASE.**


---

[Continuation of a lecture delivered by Rev. James A. O'Connor in Masonic Temple, New York, April 12, 1896, the first part of which was published in *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* for June, 1896.]

II.

**W**HEN Father Sylvester Harrington came to me in April, 1894, and expressed his desire to leave the Roman Catholic Church, and renounce the priesthood, I received him into Christ's Mission, the home we have established at 142 West Twenty-first street, this city, for men like him who have lost faith in the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church and want to learn the truth of the Christian religion. He, like thousands of priests, was unhappy in the Roman priesthood. He had tried everything in his power to keep his mind and heart in subjection to the commandments and traditions of Rome, but in vain did he mortify his body with penances, long fasts, severe scourgings that caused the blood to trickle down to the floor of his cell, and the utter abnegation of self. He could not find rest or peace. He besought the Virgin Mary and all the saints to be gracious unto him, to have pity on him in his sad condition of doubt and uncertainty. They heeded him not, they had not the power to minister to a mind diseased, or to soothe a troubled heart. Not until he called upon God for mercy did light come to him and that light led him out of Romanism. When he came to Christ's Mission he knew nothing of Christ as the Great Physician of souls. He had preached Him as the founder of the Church who had died and gone to heaven, leaving the pope, bishops and priests here on earth to carry on the work of salvation. They were his vicars who alone possessed the power to forgive sins, to reconcile men to God,

to open heaven for the human race. Alas! poor Sylvester Harrington knew that though he had confessed to his brother priests hundreds of times, and had repented with tears of sorrow and anguish of heart, and had done penance in all the ways prescribed by the Church his sins were not forgiven, the peace of God had not come to him, his portion was not among the blessed.

As the world goes, to outward seeming, he was not a great sinner. He was what is called a good man. At the age of fourteen he entered the Passionist order. He has told us in his lecture, delivered in Masonic Temple a month after he came to Christ's Mission, [See *CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, June 1894], that he was induced to join the Passionists by his confessor, a member of that order who conducted a mission or revival in young Harrington's parish church in Boston. The Passionist father worked upon the feelings of the youth and told him he had a vocation for the priesthood and even for the strictest order in the Church. It was the will of God that he should become a Passionist, and he would be lost forever if he disobeyed the divine call. He entered the monastery before the mind had been formed or the body developed, as is the case with nine-tenths of those who become monks and nuns. They know nothing of the world in which they live. They follow the vain delusion that happiness can be found only within cloistered walls. They learn, after many years of sad experience, that this delusion is a lie. The same confessor who induced Harrington to become a monk, left the monastery some years afterwards, renounced the priesthood, and settled down to the everyday life of this world, with a wife whom he had chosen from among his fair penitents.

Father Harrington has described his

life in the monastery in Hoboken in words that burn into the heart. Hear him:

DOWN-CAST EYES.

"Picture to yourself a boy of fourteen years entering the gloomy portals of the monastery which practically closed behind him forever. He is never allowed to pass beyond those walls for many years after his entrance. When his spirit has been utterly crushed he is occasionally permitted to take a walk, but he is closely guarded by a keen eyed ecclesiastic, who watches his every movement and directs his every step. He must never raise his eyes from the ground, not even to look into the face of his companion—no, not even to look into the face of his own mother should he meet her on the street. Every night he is questioned by his director as to the number of faces he has seen, even inadvertently, during the day, and if he has looked upon more than five faces he is summarily penanced! More than this, he is tongue-tied—he must not open his mouth to speak until the signal is given by the clerical watch-dog who is by his side."

SCOURGING THE BODY.

"In the monastery, he is taught that his body is the greatest enemy of his salvation next to Satan himself, and that he must scourge and macerate and starve his delicate boyish frame into subjection to the spirit. Thrice a week—and during the penitential seasons of Lent and Advent, four times a week—he must apply the cruel scourge to his tender back and limbs; and oh, Christian friends, what a tale I could tell of this cruel practice! I have heard the heavy blows of the self-inflicted scourge resounding through the corridors of the monastery! I have seen the floor and choir altar sprinkled with the blood of young boys made almost insane by monastic fanaticism. I have seen displayed scourges with long and piercing thorns

and sharp knife blades, still wet with blood, shed the night before by a young monk, driven to his shocking self-torture by the word and example of men hardened and hoary in the perpetration of these deeds of fanatical imbecility!"

DEGRADING, BEASTLY PRACTICES.

"Nor is this the practice of a day or a year—it extends throughout the lifetime of a monk. Talk about your prisons, jails and penitentiaries—why, the sufferings and privation and loss of personal liberty in such places would be bliss in comparison to life in the Hoboken Monastery. I could go on for hours with descriptions of the means employed to bring the young monk into subjection. How he is compelled frequently to eat his meals on the bare floor in the public refectory in the presence of the whole community; how he is forced to do penance by licking up the floor and dirt with his tongue; obliged to kneel and mumble prayers with his hands between his knees and the floor; forced to kiss the feet of his fellow-monks in the public refectory; made to prostrate himself full length before each monk while they stalk by him, or cast himself on his knees and beat his breast, calling upon them to pray for him, a miserable sinner.

"When the novice is received into the order he is conducted to the altar, where 'mid solemn rites and lighted tapers and many Latin prayers, a large black cross is put upon his shoulders and a crown of thorns upon his head, and he takes upon himself three vows—poverty, chastity and obedience. I was but sixteen when I took these vows which were to bind me to the service of the monastery forever. The last vestige of freedom and liberty that was left me was sacrificed at that moment."

SHOULD NOT BE TOLERATED.

"I am sure you will say with me that it is a disgrace to the civilization of the nineteenth century that such a relic of

the dark ages could flourish and be tolerated in America to-day. I can only suppose that it is the broad spirit of toleration which characterizes American citizens that renders these things possible. Perhaps it is best so; but it is not improbable that in the future the assiduity and zeal that brought to light the cruelties of the Inquisition of the middle ages shall be brought to bear upon certain monastic institutions in this country in order to prevent, if nothing more, the ruin of the lives and prospects of many a bright American lad.

"It is claimed that the door of the monastery is open to those who wish to depart; but this is only half true, for that door is so hedged around by spiritual, yea, and physical barriers, that it is rendered morally impossible to burst through them.

"To stamp out every sentiment of true manhood; to grind human nature into the very dust; to humble and break the spirit of every unfortunate youth that comes within its clutches, is the object of monasticism. Am I not right then in concluding that this system is pernicious in practice, destructive of the very principles of freedom and, therefore, of true Christianity?"

This young man, American born, was subjected to this horrible life from his fourteenth year until he was ordained a priest in the Hoboken Monastery in 1890. Why did he submit to such an inhuman state of existence? He was a virtuous youth who had never committed a crime or violated any law, and yet he was forced to live in a more degrading condition than was imposed upon felons in our penitentiaries. The only answer to this is that he thought he was thus pleasing God. His false teachers told him that the heavenly Father delighted in such a life, and that he could save his soul only by submission to their rules.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

## CONVERTS FROM ROME.

THE greatest pleasure in life for a Christian worker is to know that his labor is not in vain in the Lord. He has the promise that the seed sown in His name will in good time bear fruit, and the word of the Lord shall not return void. But "He knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust," and in His loving kindness He strengthens the hands and cheers the hearts of the laborers in His vineyard by showing signs of souls converted and lives made happy.

During the last three months we have received many letters from converts which we had not the opportunity to publish in these overcrowded pages, but we shall find room for them by and by. Meantime let not our converted friends hesitate to write an account of the Lord's dealing with them, and our Christian friends to report the conversions that came to their knowledge. All shall appear in good season.

The following letter is only one of many recently received:

CONVERTED BY READING THE MAGAZINE.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., August 8, 1896.  
REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

*Dear Sir:*—I am so thankful to God for your blessed CONVERTED CATHOLIC and the good work the Lord has placed in your hands. Your magazine has helped very much to bring my dear wife to the precious light of a personal Saviour out of the darkness of the Roman Catholic Church. I pray that God's richest blessing might rest upon you and your work, and may the dear Lord help me and my good wife to bring, by the help of your paper, some other precious souls out of Rome into the light and truth and liberty of the children of God. Your work for Christ will be rewarded in the salvation of many souls.

Your brother in the Lord, D. R. J.